



CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Urban Design Commission

MEETING MINUTES

February 10, 2021

A meeting of the City of Newton Urban Design Commission (UDC) was held virtually on Wednesday, February 10th, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86492884809>

Ruthanne Fuller,
Mayor

The Chair, Michael Kaufman, called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M.

Barney Heath,
Director
Planning & Development

I. Roll Call

Those present were Michael Kaufman (Chair), Jim Doolin, John Downie, Bill Winkler, Visda Saeyan, Robert Linsky, and Carol Todreas. Shubee Sikka, Urban Designer, was also present.

Shubee Sikka,
Urban Designer
Planning & Development

II. Regular Agenda

Sign Permits

Members
Michael Kaufman, Chair
Jim Doolin
John Downie
Robert Linsky
Carol Todreas
William Winkler
Visda Saeyan

1. 447 Centre Street – Newton Wine Warehouse

- **Applicant/Representative:** Carol Fournier, Fast Signs
- **Proposed Signs:**
 - Reface of one wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 36 sq. ft. of sign area on the western façade facing the rear parking lot.
 - Reface of one wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 18 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern façade facing Centre Street.
- **Discussion:**
 - The Commission asked if the applicant was just replacing the panels in the existing sign. The applicant responded yes; they are just swapping out the inserts.

1000 Commonwealth Ave.
Newton, MA 02459
T 617/796-1120
F 617/796-1142

MOTION: Mr. Linsky made a motion to approve the sign at 447 Centre Street – Newton Warehouse Wines. Mr. Winkler seconded the motion, and none opposed. All the members present voted, with a 7-0 vote, Michael Kaufman, John Downie, James Doolin, Robert Linsky, Visda Saeyan, Carol Todreas, and William Winkler in favor and none opposed. The decision is hereby incorporated as part of these minutes. According to the Newton Zoning Ordinance, staff concurs with the recommendation to approve the signs as proposed.

www.newtonma.gov



3. 1134 Beacon Street – Caprese Cafe

- Proposed Sign:
 - Reface of one free-standing principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 14 sq. ft. of sign area perpendicular to Beacon Street.
 - Reface of one secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 18 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern façade facing Beacon Street.

- Discussion:
 - The Commission confirmed with the applicant that they are just replacing the sign panels. The Commission commented about the illumination. The Commission recommended the applicant chose one of the two:
 - Either have a darker background
 - Or black out the white area at night only the letters will show through.

The applicant said that they will need to check with the business owner.

MOTION: Mr. Kaufman made a motion to approve the sign at 1134 Beacon Street – Caprese Café on condition that the white portion of the sign is blacked out, so it’s not illuminated at night. Mr. Downie seconded the motion, and none opposed. All the members present voted, with a 7-0 vote, Michael Kaufman, John Downie, James Doolin, Robert Linsky, Visda Saeyan, Carol Todreas, and William Winkler in favor and none opposed.

2. 845 Washington Street – Clover Food Lab.

- Applicant/Representative:

Scott Lombardi, Mark Development
- Proposed Signs:
 1. One wall mounted split principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 45 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street (L1).
 2. One perpendicular blade split principal sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street (L2).
 3. One wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 45 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the internal plaza (L4).
 4. One perpendicular secondary blade sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade perpendicular to the internal plaza (L3).
 5. One perpendicular secondary blade sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing the internal plaza (L5).
 6. One wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 11 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade facing the rear parking lot (L6).

- Documents Presented: Sign permit application and supporting documents

- Presentation and Discussion:
 - The applicant provided a summary of the project (see above). The applicant also pointed out that they have revised location and size for blade sign L3.

- Applicant commented L3 and L6 sign were added to the comprehensive sign package since it was last discussed. L6 was not shown earlier because this commercial space doesn't have a door at the rear but has a door facing the plaza so they can have outdoor seating. The applicant commented that not having a sign facing the parking lot was an oversight, it makes a lot of sense to have a sign facing the parking lot.
 - The Commission commented that L3 sign is not necessary or appropriate, instead it can become a window sign, it can also have an arrow. The applicant mentioned that Clover Food Lab. will eventually serve coffee from a window facing the plaza. It will not happen in the short term but sometime in the future.
 - The Commission asked what the need is for so many signs. The Commissioners recommended that the applicant consider choosing one sign, either L4 or L5. L4 is probably not necessary and L5 would do much a more effective job. Not many people will see sign L4 except for the people coming from the residential lobby. The applicant commented that they feel the sign over the door is important to identify the business. It's a second front of the store. The Commissioners said a blade sign over the door will serve the same purpose and will be most useful. The Commission commented that L4 is in keeping with the general perspective where the signs should be located. A blade sign will be effective.
 - The Commission asked about the directory sign. The applicant informed that "Soofa" sign is considered a non-accessory sign and is not allowed to be installed so it has been eliminated. The applicant also said that there is not central directory sign for the retailers. The staff mentioned that the Legal department has confirmed that a non-accessory sign is not allowed as per the zoning ordinance. The Commission commented that the applicant should consider other directory signs for this property.
 - The applicant commented that L1, L2, L4 and L5 are consistent with the sign package discussed at earlier meetings.
 - The Commission commented that it is very helpful to have CVS blade sign, when you are walking along Washington Street, only the blade sign is visible. The blade sign for Clover along Washington Street will be helpful, similarly blade sign at the courtyard will be very helpful. The wall sign won't be visible to anyone since it won't be visible to pedestrians walking in the courtyard and there will be no cars in the courtyard, so it won't really help anyone.
 - The Commission recommended that if the applicant choses to keep L5 sign, then it should move closer to the door, a few feet from the wall because two signs don't need to be in the same place.
- Public Comment:

The UDC also heard from the following members of the public:

Schuyler Larrabee: Mr. Larrabee observed that L2 and L5 are the same size and perpendicular to the wall. It appears that those two signs are associated with the entrances to the business. Keeping L2 and L5 will be good. It appears that L5 will be visible from the parking lot. There is no benefit to L4. Mr. Larrabee recommended signs L1, L2, L5, and L6 should be chosen and not L3 and L4. L1 will be useful to people who are driving on Washington Street.

MOTION: Mr. Kaufman made a motion to approve the signs L1, L2, eliminate L3, and let the applicant chose two signs from L4, L5, and L6 at 845 Washington Street – Clover Food Lab. Mr. Winkler seconded

the motion, and none opposed. All the members present voted, with a 7-0 vote, Michael Kaufman, John Downie, James Doolin, Robert Linsky, Visda Saeyan, Carol Todreas, and William Winkler in favor and none opposed.

The UDC recommended to approve the secondary sign L6 with a **condition**. The UDC recommended to add a lighting dimmer to the sign L6. The Commission recommended at the meeting that the applicant choose to keep 2 signs from L4, L5, and L6. The Commission recommended that if the applicant chooses to keep L5 sign, then it should move closer to the door, a few feet from the wall.

Comprehensive Sign Package

- **Applicant:** Scott Lombardi, Mark Development
- **Documents Presented:** Trio comprehensive sign package
- **Comprehensive Sign Package Summary:** The applicant is proposing the following signage:

Building Identification Signs

1. One wall mounted principal identity sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 25 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing Washington Terrace.
2. One wall mounted principal identity sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 77 sq. ft. of sign area at the corner building façade facing Washington Street and Walnut Street.
3. One principal identity sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 6 sq. ft. of sign area at the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
4. One window principal identity sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 6 sq. ft. of sign area at the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.
5. One directional sign, non-illuminated to indicate the entrance to the parking garage on the northern building façade facing the rear driveway.

Commercial Space # 1 (CVS)

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 52 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 3 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.
3. One window sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 8 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.
4. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 52 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing Washington Terrace.
5. One perpendicular secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 33 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade facing the rear parking lot.

Commercial Space # 2

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 60 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.

3. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 26 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the rear parking lot.
4. One perpendicular secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade facing the rear parking lot.

Commercial Space # 3

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 60 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.
3. One wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 35 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the rear parking lot.
4. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade facing the rear parking lot.

Commercial Space # 3a

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 60 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.

Commercial Space # 4 (Clover Food Lab.)

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 45 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing Washington Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.
3. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 45 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the internal plaza.
4. One perpendicular blade sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade perpendicular to the internal plaza.
5. One perpendicular blade sign, non-illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing the internal plaza.
6. One wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 11 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade facing the rear parking lot.

Commercial Space # 5

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 100 sq. ft. of sign area at the corner of the building façade facing Washington Street and Walnut Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade perpendicular to Washington Street.
3. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade perpendicular to Walnut Street.

Commercial Space # 6

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 80 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade perpendicular to Walnut Street.
3. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 50 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the internal plaza.
4. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade perpendicular to the internal plaza.
5. Two awning signs, non-illuminated on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.

Commercial Space # 7

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 80 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.
2. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade perpendicular to Walnut Street.
3. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 50 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the internal plaza.
4. One perpendicular blade sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the northern building façade perpendicular to the internal plaza.
5. Two awning signs, non-illuminated on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.

Commercial Space # 8 (BARN SHOES)

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 34 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.
2. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 20 sq. ft. of sign area on the southern building façade facing the internal plaza.
3. One wall mounted secondary sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 20 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the parking lot.
4. One awning sign, non-illuminated on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.

Commercial Space # 9 (New Art Center)

1. One wall mounted principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the eastern building façade facing Walnut Street.
 2. One perpendicular principal sign, internally illuminated, with approximately 9 sq. ft. of sign area on the western building façade facing the internal plaza.
- Presentation and Discussion: The applicant's representative provided a summary of the project (see above). The applicant also pointed out that they have revised location and size for blade sign for Commercial Space #4 (sign L3).
 - Discussion: The Urban Design Commission had the following comments and recommendations:

- The Commission received an email from an abutter of the property, Beth Smith and UDC raised concerns that were raised by Ms. Smith. The Commission raised a concern about dimming the signs facing the rear parking lot. There was a concern about actual signs and UDC observed that some of the signs shown are placeholders and are not actual signs. The applicant said that “Petpal” and “Alhaspa” signs are just placeholders and not actual signs. The applicant mentioned that they have been talking to the neighbors and their main concern is the light level of signs facing the rear parking lot. The applicant reminded the Commission approved (at a previous meeting) the “resident parking” sign with a condition that the sign will have an option to be dimmable.
- The Commission requested the applicant to submit a sign package showing the signs that have been approved by UDC till February 10th including but not limited to CVS signage, building identification signage, The Barn, Clover Food Lab. signage. Staff recommended that the applicant update the sign package with all the signs that have been approved by UDC to date but in the future sign package could be used as a reference and the applicant will not need to update it in the future. The Commission agreed with staff.
- The applicant said that the old existing pylon sign on Walnut Street, was at one-point part of the sign package, it was going to be repurposed and reused. The applicant commented that it was in poor shape, so they decided to remove it. The Commission appreciates that.

MOTION: Mr. Downie made a motion to approve the comprehensive sign package at 845 Washington Street and 245 Walnut Street. Mr. Winkler seconded the motion, and none opposed. All the members present voted, with a 7-0 vote, Michael Kaufman, John Downie, James Doolin, Robert Linsky, Visda Saeyan, Carol Todreas, and William Winkler in favor and none opposed. The UDC approved the comprehensive sign package on the **condition** that all signs facing the parking lot shall be dimmable.

Design Review

1. 383-387 Boylston Street Design Review

- **Owner/Applicant:**
- **Representatives:**
 - Laurance Lee, Rosenberg, Freedman & Lee, LLP
 - Mark Dooling, Dooling & Company Associates
 - Federico Arellano, Dooling & Company Associates
- **Documents Presented:** Context plan, site plan, landscape plan, floor plans, street diagrams, elevations, sections, perspectives, and context materials
- **Project Summary:** The applicant is proposing a 3-story, 12-unit, residential building with below-grade parking on a parcel between Boylston Street and Jackson Street in Thompsonville. The site is at the edge of the existing commercial district at the foot of Langley Road to the East and low-rise residential to the West. The applicant is proposing the units in a variety of sizes and types, both flats and duplex, market rate and inclusionary.

The applicant is seeking relief for the following:

- Special permit for development in business district over 20,000 S.F. or more of new gross floor area (SP).
- 3 stories building on Business 1 district (SP).

- Residential use above ground floor on Business 1 district (SP).
 - Residential use at ground floor on Business 1 district (SP).
 - Extending non-conforming side setback at East side. Existing setback 4.2' proposed setback 8'.
 - Relief for a wall over 4 feet tall at West side setback.
 - Parking spaces relief. Provided 22 Required 24 (by Special permit 15 spaces required).
- **Presentation:** The applicant's representative provided a summary of the project (see above).
 - **Discussion:** The Urban Design Commission had the following comments and recommendations:

The Urban Design Commission (UDC) commented that the building fits nicely on the site. It is a nice breakdown of massing. It is a huge improvement as compared to existing conditions. The proposal is an appropriate solution for this site and UDC is looking forward to seeing more design development.

Site Plan, Circulation and Connectivity

- The UDC commented that the issue of having two fronts (Jackson and Boylston Streets) has been solved well by putting the lobby on the side and connecting the lobby to both the streets by a walkway.

Building Massing, Height and Architecture

- The UDC recommended to create a clear expression for the second entrance door on Boylston Street side, maybe a canopy above the door (like a main entrance). It was also recommended to make the square window above the door a little bigger to help get more daylight in the stairwell.
- One of the members recommended to provide more balconies on Jackson Street side (a pleasant neighborhood street) and fewer balconies on Boylston Street side (a busy traffic road). The applicant responded that the balconies on Boylston Street elevation help to articulate the massing of the building and improve the insulation, they help to create shade for the windows since it is south facing. The member suggested it may be a good idea to have glazing for all the balconies facing Boylston Street. Not all the members agreed with this recommendation.
- The UDC recommended to provide deeper balconies so there is enough space to provide table and chairs, especially facing Jackson Street.
- The UDC commented that according to the Jackson Street elevation, the grade drops from west to east however, the project's wall appears to be at one level. It was recommended that the applicant investigate the level change again. It appears that the grade is on the same level with the street at the east side versus the west side.
- One of the members commented that since there are a lot of single-family homes on that street, so it is nice to see a break in the façade on the right side of the Jackson Street façade however on the left side, there is still a large mass. The member to provide a similar break on the left side as well, maybe make it look more like a townhouse. Not all the members agreed with this recommendation. The applicant responded that they will explore more regarding breaks in massing.

- There was discussion about the materials. The applicant commented that they haven't finalized the materials yet. They would like to have contrast. The applicant commented that they would like to have a different material for the entry, maybe metal siding to give an accent to the entry. The applicant indicated they will be working more on the material choices.
- Based on changes with building code, the UDC recommended to investigate having 1 stairwell instead of 2.

Landscape, Streetscape and Public Open Space

- The UDC recommended to provide some street trees on Jackson Street side between the sidewalk and the curb.
- The UDC recommended to provide landscaping in front of the building along Jackson street. It will be good to provide landscaping next to the entries to the units if there is enough space.
- The UDC recommended to provide more landscape buffer on Boylston Street side, maybe a stone wall, more greenery. A pergola may also help to provide more separation from Boylston street.

2. 967 Washington Street Design Review

- Owner/Applicant: Ernie Rogers
- Representatives:
 - Terry Morris, Attorney
 - Alan Mayer, Mayer + Associates Architects
- Documents Presented: Context plan, site plan, architectural drawings, floor plans, elevations, perspectives, and context materials
- Project Summary: The applicant is proposing a 27-unit residential condominium with 5,000 sq. ft. of street level retail or office. The site currently consists of 3 lots on the corner of Washington Street and Walker Street. The lot on Washington Street is currently retail while the 2 lots on Walker Street are residential. The number of units allowed by zoning is 28 units for the combined parcels. The applicant is requesting a rezoning of the lot to a MU-4 district to allow for a fourth floor and therefore a more compact and efficient floor plate.

The applicant is proposing underground parking with 1 space per 2-bedroom unit. The parking is accessed off walker street in a continuation of the retail plinth. The applicant is also proposing a 2-family house on Walker Street that would continue the residential street scale of the street while still maintaining generous green space.

The applicant has 2 basic proposals to review with multiple variations possible for both in terms of materials and color. The applicant's intent is to provide a preliminary plan and representation in order to get feedback from the community and the city. At the request of the Commission, the applicant presented a 3rd option (a 3-story building) as well.

- Presentation: The applicant's representative provided a summary of the project (see above). The applicant presented three options:
 - Option 1: 4-story building with flat roof
 - Option 2: 4-story building with sloping roof
 - Option 3: 3-story building, this option was not as well developed as the other 2 options

- Discussion: The Urban Design Commission had the following comments and recommendations:

General comments and recommendations:

Site Plan, Circulation and Connectivity

- There were questions about the site plan. The UDC requested a more detailed site plan to understand the relation between the building, landscaping, parking, garage ramp, and the townhomes.
- It was asked if the applicant explored putting the garage entrance off the parking lot so there are not 2 curb cuts next to each other. The two vehicular entrances next to each other are not good and UDC would like the applicant to explore other solutions. It also appears making a left out of the parking ramp is very close to the road.

Building Massing, Height and Architecture

- The UDC commented that commercial space feels like an appendage to the main building. The UDC recommended to integrate retail into the building, so it is 1 building and does not appear to be two separate buildings. It appeared at first that the applicant was retaining the existing retail. Since the applicant is tearing down the building, it is an excellent opportunity to ensure that it looks like a single building. It could be achieved with the help of materials, with color or form.
- One of the members commented that it may be a good idea to eliminate the retail at this site. This recommendation is based on current and projected conditions: it is not the highest and best use of the ground floor space.
- The UDC recommends using fewer materials instead of 5 different materials.
- Some of the members like the idea of a sloping roof on this building, so it is better integrated with the neighborhood. While some other members thought that the sloping roof added to the height/ bulk.

Landscape, Streetscape and Public Open Space

- The UDC recommended to add more greenery at the site.
- The UDC recommended the applicant explore possibility of planting some trees across the street, next to the Turnpike.

Specific comments and recommendations about the three options:

Option 1: four story building with flat roof

- Some of the members commented that flat roofed solution is better because of less bulk. There is too much bulk in the four-story option with a sloping roof.
- Some of the members recommended to maybe use 1 material, like brick. It will also help to pull the building forward over top of the retail, pull a portion of the building forward, maybe at the corners so two corner bays are all brick coming straight down and being part of the retail and then continued to push and pull a little to break it up, maybe break it at the entry point as well. It may also help to pitch it down along Walker Street and toward the

neighboring house on Washington Street. It may be that there are too many materials that is making it look even bigger than it is.

Option 2: 4 story building with sloping roof

- Some members commented that the scheme with the sloping roof fits better since its picking up elements from the neighboring house.
- Some other members commented that it makes the building much taller and very bulky.
- It was also commented that this option has two materials which is more successful than the first scheme that has a few different materials.

Option 3: 3 story building

- The UDC commented that the three-story option appears to be most appropriate for this site and should be further developed.
- The UDC observed that the three-story option did not have any retail.
- One of the members recommended to explore the option of eliminating the townhomes and instead step down the building towards the neighborhood. It will probably help to make the site plan and parking work a lot better as well.

Public Comments:

The UDC also heard from the following members of the public:

Councilor Pamela Wright

Peter Bruce, President of Newtonville Area Council (NAC)

Meg W., 957 Washington Street

Schuyler Larrabee

Peter Harrington

Councilor Wright commented that Washington Street Vision Plan allows this property to be 3 stories. It's a transition area before you get into Village Centers or Washington Street or Walnut Street where it is taller. In this area, the tallest building is supposed to be a maximum of 3 stories.

Mr. Bruce commented that NAC objects to the height, the Washington Street Vision Plan should be respected. Mr. Bruce commented that Principle Group also said that the current heights should be respected, 3 stories were the maximum. The NAC strongly encourages the applicant to stay within those parameters. Regarding conserving land by going taller, it appears not a lot of land will be conserved by increasing the height from 3 to 4-stories. Even though Trio is not too far away and as Principle Group pointed out this is an inter-village center area, it's not part of Newtonville Village Center.

Meg W. commented that the proposed 4-story building is not in scale with the Washington Street Vision Plan. The document that created the Washington Street Vision Plan was the Hello Washington Street report that was presented by the Principle Group. Four-story is inconsistent with what Principle Group suggested for this neighborhood/block. She commented that this development resides west of her house and it will eclipse the sun all day all season long. There will be no sunlight to the backyard as a result of this development. This area has already taken a quality of life blow when Mass DOT cut down all the foliage across the street along Mass. Turnpike. It has had a profound negative impact on this neighborhood. There is a huge increase

in sound, pollution, and the heat that emits from asphalt from the Mass. Turnpike. She also pointed out that there is some reference to the abutting house on Walker Street, the abutting house on Walker Street is the same height as her house. There will be a lot of cleaning that will need to be done on the façade because of the pollution that accumulates from the Mass. Turnpike after the foliage was cut down.

Mr. Larrabee commented that this stretch of Washington Street has a fair amount of residential buildings that have commercial uses in them. The 3-story plan has some merit to it, a real roof on top of it will be helpful. He also commented that bending around the corner and stepping down will be helpful.

Mr. Harrington said he lives just around the corner on Lowell Avenue. He commented that he was glad to hear that there is a 3-story option because the proposed 4-story option overshadows the apartment building across Walker Street. He also commented that it may be an issue to change the zone, it may be a spot zoning issue that should be investigated.

The applicant mentioned that they were encouraged to pursue a zoning change in order to get retail and 4 stories. UDC recommends against that concept. The Washington Street Vision was carefully done, and this part of Washington Street is supposed to be limited to 3 stories. The UDC supports the Washington Street Vision. The applicant needs to settle on a scheme for this property, rather than bringing conceptual choices to UDC.

The UDC recommended to explore the 3-story scheme that eliminates the townhomes with the building stepping down on Walker Street and to the neighboring house on Washington Street. Some members thought that the sloping roof adds to the mass and bulk while other members thought it makes it look more neighborly. The UDC also recommended to reduce the number of materials on the façade. The site plan also needs to be worked on, like curb cuts, parking, townhomes. A landscape plan will also be helpful, explore ways to increase greenery at the site.

Additional materials requested:

- **Site Plan:** The UDC requested a more detailed site plan to understand the relation between the building, landscaping, parking, garage ramp, and the townhomes.
- **Sections** will be helpful for future discussion
- **Landscape Plan**
- UDC would also like to see more detail on townhomes

III. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kaufman made a motion to adjourn the meeting and there was general agreement among the members.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Shubee Sikka

Approved on April 14, 2021.